

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X		
JARED J. GROGAN,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	20-CV-3345 (LTS) (OTW)
	:	
-against-	:	<u>ORDER</u>
	:	
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY and NYU IN ABU	:	
DHABI CORPORATION,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
-----X		

ONA T. WANG, United States Magistrate Judge:

In my July 18 and August 11, 2023, orders (ECF Nos. 95 and 99), I granted *pro se* Plaintiff additional time, until September 15, 2023, to file a supplement to his First Amended Complaint (ECF 48). Plaintiff filed two lengthy letters about his case and the Court’s handling thereof (neither labeled as a supplement to his complaint), the first dated August 3, 2023, but entered on August 11, 2023 (ECF 100), and the second dated September 10, 2023, and entered on September 13, 2023 (ECF 102, redacted version at ECF 110-1). The September letter addressed numerous issues, one of which the Court treated as a motion for recusal, which I addressed in my October 12, 2023, Opinion and Order (ECF 110). In a further Order, issued on October 23, 2023, I addressed the other issues and requests raised in Plaintiff’s September letter (ECF 111). Plaintiff’s August letter, which also (in part) took issue with my handling of Plaintiff’s case, also includes additional facts and allegations against Defendants. Because Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, **the Court liberally construes ECF Nos. 48 and 100, taken together, as the operative complaint in this action.**

The Court conducted pre-settlement conference calls on February 2, 2023, April 20, 2023, and May 11, 2023, during which the Court was not able to resolve any issues in this case. After settlement discussions failed, the Court ordered the parties to file a joint status letter proposing next steps in this case. (ECF 88). After missing further Court deadlines, Plaintiff sought to file a “supplemental amendment” to his complaint (ECF 92), which ultimately led to the filing of ECF 100.

Given this timeline of events, the parties have clearly not reached the proverbial “meeting of the minds” required to settle a case. Accordingly, Defendants’ motion to enforce the settlement agreement (ECF 104) is **DENIED**. Defendants shall state whether they want to supplement their answer (ECF Nos. 51 and 52), in light of Plaintiff’s supplement, ECF 100, **by Wednesday, February 7, 2024**.

The Clerk of Court is further directed to serve a copy of this Order on *pro se* Plaintiff.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 10, 2024
New York, New York

/s/ Ona T. Wang

Ona T. Wang
United States Magistrate Judge